DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 363 EC 202 532

AUTHOR McGuire, Joan M.
TITLE Connecticut's Pilot Programs for College Students with Learning Disabilities: Final Report.
INSTITUTION Connecticut Univ., Storrs.; Housatonic Community Coll., Stratford, CT.
SPONS AGENCY Connecticut State Board of Higher Education, Hartford.
PUB DATE Jun 86
NOTE 85p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Demonstration Programs; Eligibility; Higher Education; *Learning Disabilities; Program Evaluation; Referral; Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut

ABSTRACT

The document presents the final report on Connecticut's pilot programs for students with learning disabilities. During 1984-86, the two programs were implemented at Housatonic Community College and the University of Connecticut. Evaluation activities are reported for each program site. Among evaluation results for Housatonic College were the following: 83 students were referred for evaluation; services offered included assessment, direct instruction, content tutoring, counseling, and testing accommodations; direct student services averaged 1,200 hours per semester; the most frequently requested testing accommodation was extended time; and retention rates for program students ranged from 73 to 88%. Evaluation results for the University of Connecticut were: 105 students were referred for eligibility determination; the number of students receiving one or more hours of direct instruction per semester ranged from 14 to 25; services provided averaged 102 hours per week with mean hours per student equalling 3.5; group instruction was provided in counseling, word study, study strategies, and word processing; and mean grade point averages ranged from 2.3 to 2.7. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED294363

CONNECTICUT'S PILOT PROGRAMS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES: FINAL REPORT

Submitted to

Connecticut Department of Higher Education

by

Joan M. McGuire
Program Evaluator

June 1986

EC202532

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joan M. McGuire
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL REPORT ON CONNECTICUT'S PILOT PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NATALIE BIEBER, DIRECTOR

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
STAN SHAW, DIRECTOR
KAY NORLANDER, COORDINATOR

REPORT PREPARED BY

JOAN M. MCGUIRE

JUNE, 1986

FOR

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

These programs were funded by the Connecticut State Legislature through Special Act 84-49.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting

of the

American Educational Research Association

Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NO.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	4
I. HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	6
EVALUATION RESULTS	7
- REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT	7
- PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING DIRECT STUDENT SERVICES	7
- CONSULTATION	11
- TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS	12
- STUDENT OUTCOME MEASURES	12
II. THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	17
EVALUATION RESULTS	18
- REFERRAL AND ASSESSMENT	18
- PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INDIVIDUALIZED STUDENT PROGRAMS	21
- CONSULTATION	24
- TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS	26
- STUDENT OUTCOME MEASURES	28
DISCUSSION	29
REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX A	34
- A-1 PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES	35
- A-2 BATTERY OF TESTS FOR ASSESSMENT	38
- A-3 PROGRAM BROCHURE	39
APPENDIX B	40
- B-1 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	41
- B-2 STAFFING PATTERN	45
- B-3 ADMISSIONS GUIDELINES AND CORRESPONDENCE	47
- B-4 REFERRAL FORM	51
- B-5 ASSESSMENT BATTERY	52
- B-6 PROGRAM BROCHURE	53
- B-7 DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES	54

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE NO.
TABLE 1:	NUMBER OF REFERRALS BY SOURCE HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	8
TABLE 2:	REFERRAL FOLLOWUP ACTIVITIES HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	9
TABLE 3:	SUMMARY OF DIRECT STUDENT SERVICES: NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED AND MEAN SEMESTER HOURS PER STUDENT HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	10
TABLE 4:	SUMMARY OF CONSULTING HOURS HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	11
TABLE 5:	SUMMARY OF TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	13
TABLE 6:	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RETURNING BY SEMESTER HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	15
TABLE 7:	SEMESTER SUMMARY OF STUDENT GRADE POINT AVERAGES HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	16
TABLE 8:	NUMBER OF REFERRALS BY SOURCE THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	20
TABLE 9:	SUMMARY OF REFERRAL FOLLOWUP ACTIVITIES THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	22
TABLE 10:	SUMMARY OF DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	25
TABLE 11:	SUMMARY OF ON-CAMPUS CONSULTING ACTIVITIES THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	24
TABLE 12:	SUMMARY OF TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	27
TABLE 13:	GRADE POINT AVERAGES FOR SPRING 1986 PARTICIPANTS	28
FIGURE 1:	INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	23

CONNECTICUT'S PILOT PROGRAMS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES: FINAL REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During 1984-1986, two pilot programs for college students with learning disabilities (LD) were funded as a result of Special Act 84-49 passed by the Connecticut General Assembly. Data regarding program implementation and outcomes were gathered with the assistance of staff members at Housatonic Community College and the University of Connecticut, sites of the funded programs. Findings from evaluation activities are presented for each institution.

Housatonic Community College

- Eighty three students were referred for evaluation to determine eligibility as learning disabled.
- Faculty, public and private agencies and self-referrals accounted for over 70% of referrals.
- Sixty eight of the 83 referrals (82%) were identified as learning disabled.
- Services offered by the LD program included assessment, direct instruction, content tutoring, counseling and testing accommodations.
- Staff included the Project Director, Executive Assistant, three resource specialists and a diagnostician (per contractual agreement).
- Direct student services averaged approximately 1,200 hours per semester.
- Consultation at Housatonic with administrators, faculty and staff included approximately 230 hours of direct contact.
- Consultation outside Housatonic as a form of dissemination activity totaled nearly 250 hours.
- The most frequently requested testing accommodation was extended time (251 such requests were fulfilled in 1985-86).

- The mean grade point averages for LD sudents were as follows:

Fall 1984:	2.66
Spring 1985:	2.25
Fall 1985:	2.36
Spring 1986:	2.66

- Retention rates (those students returning for the following semester) were:

Fall 1984:	87%
Spring 1985:	80%
Fall 1985:	73%
Spring 1986:	88% (projected for Fall 1986)

The University of Connecticut

- One hundred and five students were referred to the LD program to determine eligibility for services.

- Nearly half (46%) of all referrals were from Admissions staff.

- Services provided by program staff included assessment, direct instruction, counseling and consultation.

- The number of students receiving one or more hours of direct instruction each semester was as follows:

Fall 1984:	14
Spring 1985:	25
Fall 1985:	25
Spring 1986:	25

- Students receiving support services work on a contract basis on specific objectives identified in an Individual University Educational Plan (IEP).

- Staff included the Project Director and Project Coordinator as well as graduate students who served as learning specialists and counselors.

- Services provided averaged 102 hours per week with mean hours per student equally 3.54.

- Group instruction was provided in counseling, word study (spelling), study strategies and word processing.

- Faculty consultation was provided on a one-to-one basis through direct contact and/or participation in team meetings.

- Research activities include areas of assessment, characteristics (academic, social, emotional) of young adults with learning problems, effective instructional strategies, and potential predictors of the successful LD college student.

- Testing accommodations have included extended and alternate testing time, use of a word processor, direct assistance in interpreting test instructions, and alternate test forms.

- Guidelines have been developed with Admissions staff regarding a cooperative process for reviewing applications of students with learning disabilities.

- Mean grade point averages for LD students were as follows:

  Fall 1985: 2.3
  Spring 1986: 2.67

- Eighty four percent of students receiving one or more hours of direct instruction in Spring 1986 earned grade point averages of 2.0 or above.

- Extensive data coding procedures are now being implemented for longitudinal data analyses.

INTRODUCTION

On the national level, awareness that postsecondary education is a realistic and valid goal for qualified students with learning disabilities (LD) has broadened over the past several years. The impetus for this development comes, in part, from legislation at both state and national levels which prohibits discrimination against the handicapped (Brinkerhoff, 1985). Furthermore, implementation of P.L. 94-142 (The Education of All Handicapped Children Act, 1975) has resulted in provision of special services for learning disabled students at the secondary level, many of whom are now pursuing higher education upon high school completion.

According to data gathered by the American Council on Education in its national longitudinal study of American college freshmen, the incidence of learning disabilities among this group has increased tenfold since 1966 (HEATH, 1986). Learning disabilities represent 14.3% of all disabilities among college freshmen.

Recognizing that institutions of higher learning in the state are admitting students with learning disabilities who may require supportive services, the Connecticut General Assembly in its 1984 legislative session passed Special Act 84-49 for the establishment of two pilot programs within the state's system of higher education. This final report provides information gathered from Housatonic Community College and the University of Connecticut which have implemented programs for learning disabled students as a result of funding provided by the State from July, 1984 through June, 1986.

General Evaluation Design and Activities

Early in the Fall of 1984, the evaluator met with project staff of both institutions to discuss various issues relating to the implementation of services for students with learning disabilities. Section 1 of Act 84-49 states the following:

> Each funded program shall include, but not be limited to, the following services: 1) diagnostic testing and evaluation of the student, 2) individualized instruction combining developmental, remedial and compensatory elements, 3) consultation with faculty and cooperative efforts to ensure equal opportunities for learning disabled students to fulfill course requirements, and 4) accommodation and modifications of testing procedures for content courses.

These provisions were reviewed and served as guides in developing the evaluation design.

Two major aspects of the programs constitute the focus for evaluation:

A. Program process, or the manner in which the program has implemented activities designed to meet program goals.

B. Program product, or the results of providing services designed to assist students with learning disabilities.

Objectives for evaluation during Year One (1984-85) centered upon documentation of the process by which the pilot programs were implemented. An interim evaluation report for Year One was delivered to the Department of Higher Education in June, 1985.

Evaluation for Year Two (1985-86) focused on continuing implementation of services as well as program product including outcomes of these services.

Within the scope of the evaluation component funding, it was reasonable to employ several measurement techniques yielding both anecdotal evidence regarding program implementation and descriptive statistics relating to services stipulated in Section 1 of Act 84-49. Staff interviews were conducted at both sites throughout the two year funding period.

Data submitted to the evaluator were gathered at the end of each academic year incorporating information from Fall and Spring semesters. Data collection forms, in some instances, were revised for Year Two to reflect the dynamic nature of program development.

Sections II and III of this final report are intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the manner by which each institution developed its program. Quantitative data are presented in descriptive format to document outcomes of each funded project.

I. HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE*

As an essential component in guiding the development of services for LD students, project goals were identified as follows:

A. To attract, identify and retain students with specific learning disabilities for whom college is a realistic goal.

B. To provide the types of support services and learning environment which are essential if the LD student is to fulfill course requirements.

C. To develop a program that can be replicated or adapted at other postsecondary institutions.

Specific objectives and a statement of program philosophy are included in Appendix A.

Any student who is officially enrolled at the college and is determined to have a specific learning disability as defined by P.L. 94-142 is eligible to participate in the program which is housed in the College's Center for Educational Services, a media resource center which includes audio-visual equipment and computer facilities.

Additional office space was available for the Project Director and was also utilized for individual student instruction and testing. Staffing for the learning disabilities program included the following:

Director - Fulltime/10 month position

Executive Assistant - Halftime/10 month position

Three (3) Resource Specialists - 10 hours/week

Diagnostician - As needed on a contractual basis

---

* The following individuals assisted in gathering data for this report:

Natalie Bieber, Program Director
Karen Sunderhauf
Shu-Jen Liu
Janet Weiss

EVALUATION RESULTS

Referral and Assessment

Students are referred to the LD program at Housatonic by a variety of sources including self, college faculty and staff, high school personnel and public agencies such as the Department of Rehabilitation Services (formerly Department of Vocational Rehabilitation). Table 1 provides an overview of the number of referrals as well as sources for 1984-1986.

Upon referral, a student participates in an intake procedure which includes completion of an information form and a personal interview. Determination of eligibility for services is carried out by the Project Director. Eligibility is based upon information obtained in the intake interview as well as review of available records, placement testing data in math and English conducted by the College, and both psychological and diagnostic assessment as appropriate (see Appendix A for listing of tests). Informal diagnostic procedures including direct observation of students completing selected tasks are also employed as part of the evaluation process. Data presented in Table 2 highlight those activities which occurred after students' referral to the Center.

Planning and Implementing Direct Student Services

After a student is determined to be eligible by virtue of a learning disability, a variety of support services are available. Students are encouraged to assume responsibility for seeking services appropriate for their needs. Direct instruction in reading, math and written expression are provided by program staff, either individually or in small groups. As more students have been identified, more small group instruction has been implemented. Compensatory strategies in areas such as memory, organization and study skills are integrated in all instruction. Content-specific tutoring as well as counseling are also available dependent upon student needs.

As apparent in Table 3, the majority of LD students have required direct instruction in specific skills of reading, writing and math. Few have needed tutoring which focused solely on content material pertaining to a specific subject. An overview of the extent and types of individualized services is provided in Table 3.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF REFERRALS BY SOURCE: 1984-1986

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

SOURCE	SEMESTER			
	FALL 1984	SPRING 1985	FALL 1985	SPRING 1986
ADMINISTRATION	3	4	1	1
FACULTY	5	6	4	4
HIGH SCHOOL PERSONNEL	6	3	3	2
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES	8	4	3	5
SELF	10	1	6	3
SUPPORT STAFF	1	0	0	0
SEMESTER TOTAL	33	18	17	15
1984-85 TOTAL		51		
1985-86 TOTAL				32

TABLE 2

REFERRAL FOLLOWUP ACTIVITIES: 1984-86

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FOLLOWUP ACTIVITY	SEMESTER			
	FALL 1984	SPRING 1985	FALL 1985	SPRING 1986
INTAKE INTERVIEW	33	18	23	15
EVALUATION				
APTITUDE	9	14	19	15
ACHIEVEMENT	28	13	19	15
LEARNING STYLE	20	18	19	15
IDENTIFICATION AS LD	23	15	17	13
REFERRED TO OTHER SOURCES				
ON CAMPUS	6	3	3	2
OUTSIDE AGENCIES	6	3	3	0

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF DIRECT STUDENT SERVICES: NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED AND MEAN SEMESTER HOURS PER STUDENT (1984-1986)

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DIRECT STUDENT SERVICES	SEMESTER			
	FALL 1984	SPRING 1985	FALL 1985	SPRING 1986
STUDENTS RECEIVING SERVICES	23	38	49	52
$\bar{X}$ HOURS PER SEMESTER PER STUDENT				
READING	17.5	20.6	11.6	17.8
WRITTEN EXPRESSION	75	80	15.7	17.3
MATH	64	48	22.1	12.2
CONTENT TUTORING	6	5	3.2	16.4
COUNSELING	8.8	12.4	10.3	8.6

Consultation

A critical element in the implementation of services for LD college students involves the support of the institution's administration, faculty and staff. On-going efforts by LD project staff are necessary to share information regarding learning disabilities as well as to work cooperatively in meeting the needs of individual LD students. Such efforts often extend beyond the institution itself and are a type of dissemination activity for informing outside sources about LD college students and services available to meet their needs. Although such efforts do not constitute direct student services, they are essential responsibilities particularly of program directors and must be included in planning staffing time.

A brochure was developed for dissemination of information regarding the program at Housatonic and has been distributed extensively to sources on and off campus (see Appendix A). The nature of the physical plant at Housatonic also contributed to informal, frequent exchanges between program staff and faculty and administrators. The College operates in a single building, thus making communication within the institution convenient and timely. The Director of Housatonic's program was involved in outreach activities throughout the funding cycle. Among her professional activities are membership on several statewide committees to promote awareness and share information regarding the adult with learning disabilities and presentations at numerous conferences throughout the state.

Table 4 documents efforts by Housatonic staff in consulting within the academic community where the program operates and in disseminating information outside the program site.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF CONSULTING HOURS: 1984-1986

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

YEAR	SITE	
	ON CAMPUS	OUTREACH
1984 - 1985	138.5	144
1985 - 1986	101.5	107

Testing Accommodations

Meeting the needs of students with learning problems involves provision of appropriate testing accommodations including extended time, oral testing, and modified testing formats. Individualized accommodations for students at Housatonic are based upon the student's specific learning style and arranged cooperatively with faculty. Such services have been available and used by many of the LD students at Housatonic as is evident in Table 5.

As a result of reviewing data collection techniques regarding testing accommodations at the end of Year One, it became apparent that logging the number of requests was essential to monitor the extent to which such services were being provided. Many students use untimed testing for one or more courses throughout a semester. Thus data for 1985-86 in Table 5 reflect not only the number of students seeking modified testing arrangements but also the number of instances such accommodations were provided.

Student Outcome Measures

In evaluating services for college students with learning disabilities, it is reasonable to consider several indicators of student progress. Traditional measures include grade point average (GPA), retention and, ultimately, completion of degree requirements. Although neither program has been in operation long enough to gather and analyze extensive data, there are several areas which yield evidence regarding program effectiveness.

Housatonic Community College serves a broad range of students with respect to age, personal goals, geographic and ethnic characteristics. Many students attend classes while holding full or parttime jobs. Their enrollment may not follow a more traditional course of study over consecutive semesters. "Stopping out" and returning at a later date is a frequent phenomenon. Because of these considerations, retention is not a critical variable. Very few students at Housatonic or within the community college system at large become ineligible to return to college.

After completion of a designated number of courses, fulltime students with averages below 1.75 may not carry a full credit load but may return. A similar rule regarding the number of courses for parttime students is in force.

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS: 1984-1986

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

YEAR	# OF STUDENTS RECEIVING SERVICE	TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION				CONTENT[1] AREA
		UNTIMED	ORAL	READER	INDIVIDUALIZED	
1984-85	44	*				E, H, M, S, SS
1985-86	27	251	8	17	23	B, E, H, M, S, SS

[1] Content areas are as follows:

B = Business
E = English/Literature
H = History
M = Math
S = Sciences (Life and Physical)
SS = Social and Behavioral Sciences

* Data were not collected regarding number of accommodations provided.

For students who feel that extenuating circumstances affected their GPA, there is an appeal procedure. Because of concern for the number of students who drop courses or elect to receive no credit, an efficiency ratio has been established to determine the appropriateness of continued study for some individuals. Application of this ratio will provide more valid data regarding students with learning disabilities as more longitudinal analyses are feasible.

In spite of these considerations, retention figures suggest that students in the LD program are experiencing success and continuing their efforts for completing courses. Figures presented in Table 6 reflect the actual return rate for students in the program. These data considered with GPA information in Table 7 provide clear evidence of student success.

Another trend in student outcomes is apparent when considering distribution of grades. Based upon the grading system of A, B, C, D or F, the percentage of grades which were Cs or above has ranged from 84% (Spring 1985) to 97% (Fall 1984). It will be useful to examine subsequent data to determine whether any patterns or relationships emerge with respect to levels of achievement and specific diagnostic data gathered for LD students.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RETURNING BY SEMESTER: 1984-1986

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RETENTION DATA	SEMESTER			
	FALL 1984	SPRING 1985	FALL 1985	SPRING 1986
NUMBER OF STUDENTS	23	38	49	52
RETENTION RATE	87%	80%	73%	88%*

* Projection for Fall 1986

TABLE 7

SEMESTER SUMMARY OF STUDENT GRADE POINT AVERAGES: 1984-1986

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

GPA DATA	SEMESTER			
	FALL 1984	SPRING 1985	FALL 1985	SPRING 1986
NUMBER OF STUDENTS	23	38	49	52
$\bar{X}$ GPA	2.66	2.25	2.36	2.66
RANGE	1.0 - 4.0	1.0 - 3.67	.5 - 3.75	1.0 - 4.0

II. THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT*

The overall intent of this project was to develop a model program for learning disabled students in a university setting. Program goals, therefore, were two-fold and fell into the areas of program development and service delivery:

A. Program Development: to develop a program to meet the needs of learning disabled students at the University of Connecticut which can serve as a model and be replicated throughout the State of Connecticut. Objectives pertaining to this goal are presented in Appendix B.

B. Service Delivery

1. To effectively and efficiently provide appropriate services to individual students with learning disabilities.

2. To assist LD students participating in the program to become independent learners.

Objectives for each service delivery goal are included in Appendix B.

This program was implemented at the University of Connecticut's main location in Storrs. Any student enrolled on a full or parttime basis may refer him or herself to the University of Connecticut's Program for Learning Disabled College Students (UPLD). The majority of participants were fulltime students. In addition, any student seeking admission may also self-refer.

Both the Program Director and Program Coordinator are members of the faculty in the Educational Psychology Department. The Director of the School Psychology Program was involved in evaluation and team meetings. Given the nature of the institution, project staff included graduate students (doctoral and masters levels) in Special Education, School Psychology and Special Education/Rehabilitative Counseling. A detailed analysis of the staffing pattern is presented in Appendix B.

---

* The following individuals assisted in gathering data for this report:

Stan Shaw, Program Director
Kay Norlander, Program Coordinator
Ania Czajkowski, Learning Disability Specialist

Location of the learning disabilities program at the University of Connecticut has centered in the School of Education, although allocation of space has been a concern throughout the funding period, particularly with respect to delivery of direct student services.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Referral and Assessment

Two groups of students constitute potential participants in the LD program: 1) applicants seeking admission to the University, and 2) students already admitted and enrolled.

Establishing an admissions policy and accompanying procedures was a major first year activity. While not one of UPLD's original program objectives, it became clear early on that this activity was essential. An ad hoc committee was formed and chaired by the Dean of Students. In addition to the Dean of Students, members of this committee included: 1) the Coordinator and Director of UPLD, 2) the Director of Disabled Student Services, and 3) the Director and Assistant Director of Admissions. Additionally, the Director of Transfer Admissions has met with members of the Admissions Office and the UPLD Coordinator to discuss the policy.

Guidelines for reviewing the applications of learning disabled students were drafted and then reviewed by University Counsel and the University 504 Coordinator/ Affirmative Action Officer. The intent of the guidelines is as follows:

1. To maintain the quality and standards established for admission to the University;

2. To provide a means for learning disabled students to present information regarding academic ability and potential to succeed at the University which does not reflect their disabilities; and

3. To guarantee identified learning disabled students the support of the University of Connecticut's Program for Learning Disabled College Students (UPLD) following formal admission to the University.

A complete copy of the guidelines as well as a letter sent to prospective candidates can be found in Appendix B.

During the project's second year, these admissions procedures were implemented. Thirty-three (33) students self-identified as learning disabled for Fall 1986 admission.

Of those 33, seven have currently been admitted (four applications are still pending). Applicants with learning disabilities are encouraged to submit additional data to determine academic ability and potential. These data are reviewed by UPLD staff with final determination regarding admissability made by the Admissions Committee.

The UPLD program is committed to all referrals ultimately being self-referrals, although initial referral sources may vary. This approach is designed to encourage full commitment on the part of the student to services offered.

Any student, fulltime, parttime, or seeking University admission, may refer him or herself to UPLD. Referral forms (see Appendix B) may be obtained directly from the UPLD Office or through the Office of Disabled Student Services. All referrals are then sent to the UPLD Program Coordinator who reviews them and schedules an initial (intake) interview. Following this interview, a Learning Disabilities Specialist (Case Manager) is assigned, if warranted, and the process of identification, diagnosis and program planning begins. Table 8 provides an overview of the sources and number of referrals to the LD program throughout the pilot project funding period.

This initial screening process assists staff in formulating an appropriate evaluative strategy. Dependent upon information collected during the referral process, further evaluation steps are often recommended.

Critical to the provision of appropriate support services to students with learning disabilities is the comprehensive delineation of each student's academic and learning strengths and weaknesses. Assessment in the areas of general ability, information processing, achievement in areas of reading, writing, spelling and mathematics, study techniques and social/emotional status are included in appropriate combinations for each student.

While formal evaluation instruments are employed, diagnostic/prescriptive teaching sessions are critical to the evaluative process. Appendix B contains the core battery of diagnostic instruments used by UPLD and a list of instruments to be selected dependent upon areas requiring additional evaluation.

As an adjunct to formal evaluation procedures, significant time is spent in the diagnostic/prescriptive phase of the evaluative process for those students enrolled at the University.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF REFERRALS BY SOURCE: 1984-1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

SOURCE	SEMESTER			
	FALL 1984	SPRING 1985	FALL 1985	SPRING 1986
ON-CAMPUS				
ADMINISTRATION	1	-	2	2
ADMISSIONS	-	12	1	35
BRANCH CAMPUS	-	2	-	1
FACULTY	2	2	3	4
SUPPORT STAFF	9	4	5	1
OTHER				
FAMILY (PARENTS)	1	4	4	-
PUBLIC AND/OR PRIVATE AGENCIES	2	-	-	-
SELF	-	3	3	2
SEMESTER TOTAL	15	27	18	45
1984-85 TOTAL		42		
1985-86 TOTAL				63

Actual instructional sessions are conducted which focus on how a student organizes and processes information while learning specific content. Probing techniques are used in order to glean essential information about the student's executive strategies and study methods.

These phases of referral and assessment are conducted for incoming students as well as enrolled students based upon self-referral and determination that such a process is warranted. As the program evolved, collaborative efforts between program staff and Admissions staff served as a form of prescreening to assist prospective applicants, high school personnel and parents to determine whether application to the University was a realistic goal. Development and dissemination of a brochure describing the LD program (see Appendix B) was helpful in presenting information to a number of individuals, including potential applicants.

Table 9 presents a summary of those activities which occur following referral.

Planning and Implementing Individualized Student Programs

Following the evaluation process, a University Planning Meeting is scheduled, including the student, UPLD Director and/or Coordinator, Learning Disabilities Specialist, and school psychologist (adjunct UPLD staff). Additional individuals such as the Director of Disabled Student Services, Dean of Students, faculty advisors and/or faculty instructing specific courses, and staff from other student support services available on campus are included as warranted according to the specific case.

Instructional goals and objectives as well as a contract between the student and the program are subsequently written by the student and case manager. A sample Goals and Objectives page from an Individual University Educational Plan (IEP) is illustrated in Figure 1. Direct instruction and services are then provided by UPLD staff to individual students, including the following areas:

Academic Advisement
Acquistion of Content
Acquisition of Exam Modifications
Career/Vocational Counseling
Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching
Evaluation
Library Skills
Mathematics
Personal Counseling
Reading
Spelling
Study Skills and Learning Strategies
Test Taking Strategies
Tutors
Word Processing
Writing

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF REFERRAL FOLLOWUP ACTIVITIES: 1984-1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

FOLLOWUP ACTIVITY	SEMESTER			
	FALL 1984	SPRING 1985	FALL 1985	SPRING 1986
INTAKE INTERVIEW	14	17	18	25
PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL EVALUATION	14	12	10	11
REFERRED TO OTHER SOURCES	3	2	7	1
UPLD SERVICES: CONSULTING, EVALUATIVE OR INSTRUCTIONAL	14	21	45	44

Overall educational goals and specific instructional objectives (these may change on a semester and/or annual basis and will be reviewed on a semester basis by the university student and the case manager).

Area: Spelling Date Implemented: January 21, 1984

Present Level of Performance: Spelling skills show specific weaknesses in need of remediation.

Long Range Goals: To facilitate improvement of specific spelling weaknesses.

Short Term Objectives	Instructional Methods: Strategies/Materials	Evaluation of Short-Term Objectives: Criteria/Evaluation Date
1. will spell single and multi-syllable words with the "wh" combination grouped by this combination. 2. will spell single and multi-syllabic words with the "au" and "aught" combinations grouped by these combinations. 3. will spell single and multi-syllabic words with the "ou" and "ought" combinations grouped by these combinations. 4. will spell single and multi-syllabic words with vowels "a", "e", "ai", and "ea", grouped by these vowels and vowel combinations to facilitate discrimination and spelling.	1. Words will be grouped by combination. 2. Rehearsal strategies will be used. 3. Paried-associate learning techniques will be employed. 4. Recommended materials: a. solving language difficulties. b. Megawords, multisyllabic words for Reading, Spelling, and Vocabulary.	Criteria: will correctly spell at least 80% of all words taught per combinations.

FIGURE 1. INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

During the Spring semester of 1985, group instruction in a number of areas was instituted. This mode of service delivery was found to be effective by UPLD staff and continues to be used in areas of career counseling, word processing, spelling, instruction, and support/discussion groups. Record keeping was revised during the second year of the program in order to determine the specific type of instruction provided for participants. This information is presented in Table 10.

Consultation

An important facet of implementing the program for students with learning problems has been consulting with administration, faculty, and professional staff. The nature of consultation varies and has included, among a number of areas, the following: 1) negotiating testing accommodations for individual students, 2) discussing specific learning problems (e.g., difficulties in written expression which warrant use of word processing), 3) participating as a member of the UPLD team, 4) discussing students' courseload and course selection, and 5) arranging for UPLD staff to attend lectures.

It is evident in Table 11 that consulting services for faculty expanded significantly during 1985-86 as more LD students were served.

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF ON-CAMPUS CONSULTING ACTIVITIES: 1984-1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

YEAR	NUMBER SERVED		
	ADMINISTRATION	FACULTY	PROFESSIONAL STAFF
1984-85	21	38	16
1985-86	21	104	17

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: 1984-1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

SEMESTER	TYPE OF SERVICE				TOTAL SERVICES
	INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION	GROUP INSTRUCTION	CONTENT TUTORING	COUNSELING	
FALL 1984*					
STUDENTS SERVED					14
$\bar{X}$ HOURS PER WEEK					3.10
SPRING 1985*					
STUDENTS SERVED					25
$\bar{X}$ HOURS PER WEEK					2.86
FALL 1985					
STUDENTS SERVED	25	5	8	3	25
$\bar{X}$ HOURS PER WEEK	2.96	.60	1.94	.83	3.90
RANGE PER WEEK	1.0 - 8.0	.5 - 1.0	1.0 - 4.0	.5 - 1.0	1.5 - 11.5
SPRING 1986					
STUDENTS SERVED	25	11	5	4	25
$\bar{X}$ HOURS PER WEEK	3.32	1.3	2.1	.50	4.30
RANGE PER WEEK	1.0 - 12.0	.5 - 2.5	.5 - 3.0	.5 - 1.0	1.0 - 13.0

* Data collection procedures did not include specific service area figures during the first year of the program.

Another form of consultation involves dissemination of program information as well as in-service training activities for interested professionals. Appendix B provides documentation of extensive outreach activities such as presentations and publications by UPLD staff.

Testing Accommodations

A variety of modifications in testing (exam) procedures have been made for individual students. All modifications are discussed with faculty members and arranged on an individual basis. The following types of modifications have been provided:

1. Extra time to write, reorganize, proof and type (word process) the exam with both handwritten and typed copies submitted (for an English course). Additionally, a spelling proof system was used by the student.

2. "Coaching" by an individual Case Manager during a large class, computer-scored exam. Instructions for completing the exam during the specified time frames, including the use of the computer form, were given. Case Manager accompanied the student to the exam and assisted only with instructions.

3. Rearranging exam schedules to allow adequate time between tests.

4. Proofing of exams for spelling errors (Sociology, Urban Studies).

5. Discussions with instructor as to exam taking strategies, areas for concentration during study prior to exam, and follow-up with instructor as to exam results (Numerous subject areas).

6. Use of computer to write exams (Numerous subject areas).

7. Change of exam format from multiple choice to short answer (Human Development and Family Relations).

Table 12 provides a summary of types of accommodations offered as well as content areas in which modified testing was arranged.

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS: 1984-1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

YEAR	# OF STUDENTS RECEIVING SERVICE	TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION				CONTENT[1] AREA
		UNTIMED	ORAL	READER	INDIVIDUALIZED	
1984-85	12	9	2	2	5	B, ED, E, EN, H, M, S, SS
1985-86						
FALL	15	13	2	1	7	AG, B, CS, ED, E, EN, FL, H, M, PS, S, SS
SPRING	20	17	1	-	5	AG, B, CS, ED, E, EN, FL, H, HDFR, M, PS, S, SS, SP

[1] Content areas are as follows:

AG = Agriculture
B = Business
CS = Computer Science
E = English
ED = Education
EN = Engineering
FL = Foreign Language
H = Humanities (History, Philosophy and Anthropology)
HDFR = Human Development/Family Relations
M = Mathematics
PS = Political Science
S = Sciences (Life and Physical)
SP = Speech and Language
SS = Social and Behavioral Sciences

Student Outcome Measures

Operationalizing procedures to gather longitudinal data regarding students in the learning disabilities program at the University of Connecticut has occurred in depth during the final semester of the funding period. Project staff have developed an extensive coding system and all participants' data files are being computerized. Measures of program effectiveness include review of objectives specified in each student's Individual University Educational Plan, increases and decreases in hourly services, grades and retention. The IEP including goals and objectives has proven useful in monitoring student progress and planning for subsequent semesters. Time needs are also recorded on these contracts.

More extensive data should be available by Fall 1986. Preliminary figures in Table 13 based upon indicators for those 25 students receiving one or more hours of direct instructional services from UPLD staff in Spring 1986 suggest positive results. Eighty four percent of the students earned semester GPAs of 2.0 or above, the standard which is used to determine satisfactory academic status. The mean grade point averages for 1985-86 were 2.3 (Fall 1985) and 2.67 (weighted according to credit hours taken for Spring 1986). As the project continues, a wealth of data will afford opportunities for in-depth analyses of numerous variables.

TABLE 13

GRADE POINT AVERAGES FOR SPRING 1986 PARTICIPANTS*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

GPA RANGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS EARNING GPA
< 1.0	4%
1.0 - 1.49	8%
1.5 - 1.99	4%
2.0 - 2.49	17%
2.5 - 2.74	12.5%
2.75 - 2.99	21%
3.0 - 3.24	21%
3.25 - 3.49	-
> 3.5	12.5%

* Transcripts were available for 24 of the 25 participants.

Discussion

Based upon the evaluation design developed for the programs at Housatonic Community College and the University of Connecticut, data were gathered to document the manner by which services for college students with learning disabilities were implemented as well as the results of these services. Evidence presented in this report supports the conclusion that within a two-year period, each institution has accomplished most goals and objectives formulated to guide program development.

Each program operates within the mainstream of the institution serving as a vehicle to provide supplementary support services for learning disabled students who are integrated into the existing curriculum. Each program reflects the mission of the institution. Housatonic has incorporated its program into the Center for Educational Services, thereby affiliating it with a student support service which had already established its function at the college. The program is flexible with a lack of formality, a feature which seems suited to the atmosphere of a community college which attracts a broad range of students with respect to age, experience and personal goals. An unstructured but very important sense of community has developed among students who frequent the Center and work with LD program staff.

The University of Connecticut's program is currently housed in the Educational Psychology Department, thus integrating it into an atmosphere where Special Education faculty and students, both graduate and undergraduate, are available. This arrangement has provided an impetus for ongoing research activities. In the Fall of 1986, a three-year Federally funded leadership training grant will commence offering a graduate training program to prepare personnel to develop LD college programs in other sites. Systematic procedures have been put into place to work effectively and efficiently with faculty. The University Planning Meeting constitutes a forum for informal faculty in-service training on a one-to-one basis. Use of a contract for documenting specific objectives individualized to each student's strengths and weaknesses is a clear, reliable method for monitoring program services as well as student progress.

Staff of the programs at both institutions have played a critical role in development of services for LD students.

As Vogel (1982) has pointed out, on essentially every campus with services for LD adults there is at least one individual who has assumed responsibility for promoting services to meet the needs of students with learning disabilities. Interviews with program administrators at Housatonic and the University of Connecticut verified a strong commitment to assisting these students. This commitment is essential if programs such as these are to be effective. Furthermore, enthusiasm of program administrators is often reflected in efforts and attitudes of other support personnel who serve as tutors or counselors. Although job descriptions in this report indicate allocation of staff time, these estimates are clearly conservative. Administrators as well as additional program staff at Housatonic and the University of Connecticut are to be commended for their efforts which often far exceeded what is contained in any job description.

It is important that staff training activities continue at each site as a method for sharing expertise, ideas and concerns among service delivery personnel who work with LD college students. This issue is particularly relevant to the University of Connecticut where graduate students serve key functions in implementing support services. With predictable turnover in such a staffing arrangement, developing a process for training personnel in effective techniques will be essential for continuity in service delivery. As consulting services are extended to outside institutions, a manual could serve many needs for training other service providers.

Through state legislative action in Spring 1986, funding has been appropriated to develop two consortia for providing outreach activities for other colleges within Connecticut seeking to meet the needs of learning disabled students. Housatonic Community College and the University of Connecticut are designated as hubs for these services. Planning is currently underway for statewide dissemination of information regarding the legal mandate for assuring equal opportunities for qualified LD students in higher education as well as practical suggestions for implementing services.

Both institutions must face the issue of allocation of space for effective service delivery. Although the program at Housatonic is housed in an existing facility, the environment is often crowded due to use of the Center of Educational Services by students with diverse needs. Input gathered from LD students in Spring 1986 via a questionnaire indicated very positive attitudes about many aspects of the program with several respondents commenting on staffing and space constraints.

Acquiring adequate physical space at the University of Connecticut has not been accomplished despite efforts by program staff to address this critical need. Given the diverse characteristics of young adults with learning disabilities, appropriating space which facilitates direct instruction is essential. Not only do many LD students have difficulty sustaining attention to tasks, but many also experience problems in establishing a positive self-concept and sense of security (Mangrum & Strichart, 1984). Institutional commitment and support of these students must include adequate physical space for program operation.

Both programs have substantiated the need among college students with learning disabilities to develop compensatory learning strategies (e.g., memory techniques, organization and study skills) to apply in college coursework. Both programs have also commented on the benefits of group instruction. As documented in Table 3, direct instruction in writing and math at Housatonic decreased dramatically during the second year of the program. This statistic does not reflect diminished services. What it does verify is use of group instruction to address common weaknesses in many LD students. Staff at the University of Connecticut recognized the efficiency of group instruction as well as benefits to participants. It will be worthwhile in both settings to continue efforts to document the effectiveness of this method of instruction and to validate specific objectives which lend themselves to such an approach.

Given the setting demands at the University of Connecticut with respect to Admissions criteria, it is important that the cooperative spirit which has evolved between Admissions and UPLD staff continue. Referrals from Admissions nearly tripled in Spring 1986 (see Table 8). Each referral necessitates personal followup by UPLD staff. As awareness of the LD program at the University spreads, increased inquiries can be expected. Identifying variables which may predict the type of student with learning problems for whom the University is a suitable educational setting could go a long way in streamlining Admissions advising. Likewise, the increase in faculty contacts in 1985-86 warrants discussion regarding alternatives to one-to-one consultation. Additional approaches to working with faculty could profit from direct input from those instructors with whom UPLD staff has already worked.

Data pertaining to application of the efficiency ratio at Housatonic, which was discussed previously, will afford useful information over time. Many students with learning disabilities have difficulty persisting in academic tasks, due, in part, to limited self-concept and previous failure oriented experiences. Gathering documentation of course completion figures for LD students at Housatonic may shed light on possible counseling issues for subsequent intervention. It is also important that requests for testing accommodations continue to be documented. Logistics of when, where and who will proctor such modifications must be worked out and taken into consideration in planning staff time.

Finally, longitudinal data collection in a number of areas will contribute to a growing body of literature regarding this population. Retention, grades, cost efficiency and student achievement outcomes should be monitored. Preliminary data from each institution verify that LD students are achieving satisfactory grades (see Tables 7 and 13). Comparable statistics on grades and retention for non-learning disabled students at each site will provide a useful margin of comparison.

Based upon two years of program development, each institution is in a favorable position to share knowledge and expertise with others in the field of learning disabilities. The National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities in a recent position paper stated that "learning disabilities are a heterogeneous group of disorders of presumed neurological origin that persist into adult life to varying degrees and with different outcomes." It is clear that Housatonic Community College and the University of Connecticut are providing support services for diverse types of students with learning disabilities. Working with high school personnel who advise and instruct potential college-bound students with learning problems is critical. Methods for assisting these young adults in selecting an appropriate postsecondary school warrant ongoing attention. Long-range planning for college must be considered as students begin their high school program so that they are adequately prepared through coursework and skills development.

Coordinated efforts on a statewide basis to share information is well underway as a result of legislative support. These two pilot projects have demonstrated both the feasibility and effectiveness of providing support services for learning disabled students at the postsecondary level. Future efforts should profit from these funded programs which will now serve as centers for outreach activities.

REFERENCES

Brinkerhoff, L. (1985). Accommodations for college students with learning disabilities: The law and its implementation. In J. Gartner (Ed.), Tomorrow is another day (pp. 89-95). Columbus, OH: AHSSPPE.

Mangrum, C.T., & Strichart, S.S. (1984). College and the learning disabled. Orlando, FL: Grune & Stratton, Inc.

Staff. (1986, May). Learning disability update. Information from HEATH, p.3.

The National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. Adults with Learning Disabilities. A Call to Action. A position paper of the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. February 10, 1985. The Orton Dyslexia Society, Baltimore, MD.

Vogel, S.A. (1982). On developing LD college programs. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15, 518-528.

APPENDIX A

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A-1: PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

A-2: BATTERY OF TESTS FOR ASSESSMENT

A-3: PROGRAM BROCHURE

A-1: PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

The Learning Disabled Postsecondary Student
Natalie Bieber

It is difficult to draw a profile of the learning disabled (LD) postsecondary student, though he manifests many of the now classic symptoms of learning disability. Most of these students have learned to read, though reading may still be a laborious process. Comprehension of the printed matter may offer more problems than actual decoding of words. Writing usually offers the most significant problem, especially under conditions of anxiety, as in a testing situation, or when the student attempts to take notes while attending to the task of following a lecture. The LD college student tends to be a speaker/listener in an environment which demands the learning style of the reader/writer.

The literature in regard to the college level LD person is limited and the research, little. It would seem that most authors assume the needs of the person at the postsecondary level are no different than those of the adolescent; the result is that most texts and articles deal with the adolescent, his problems, and strategies and methods for remediation. This writer agrees that many of the remedial strategies stay the same, but the postsecondary environment exerts much different pressures on the LD student. Time is running out in the accepted educational sense, and the real world looms menacingly close. The development and remediation of basic academic skills must take second place to the development of attainable goals for the business of life.

This writer and many others generally refer to the LD person in the masculine gender because learning disabilities are known to be more prevalent among males than females--perhaps in as high a ratio as four to one. At the postsecondary level this figure is subject to some adjustment, but still weighted toward the male. There is little homogeneity among the LD college population. Many students have average to slightly above average I.Q.s, though some show the brilliance of an Einstein, who is believed to have been a learning disabled person.

Though one might assume that cognitive ability is the major determinant for academic success at college (Deshler, 1981) a review of case histories challenges this assumption. It is the above average I.Q. student with strong motivation, commitment to hard work (the plugger) and the important X factor of adaptability who is ultimately the most successful. This is the individual who is not only able to adapt to the situation with compensatory and coping skills, but also manipulate his environment within the framework of his abilities and deficits. This is the student who can generalize strategies from one setting to another and build on his strengths--a vital ability.

Students with the above characteristics are survivors, and as such, many of them become excellent manipulators. Their coping skills may be highly sophisticated, even to the point of getting other people to carry their learning load if at all possible. Awareness of developing a dependency relationship with those who help them should be stressed. What can happen is that the independence that the LD persons are actually seeking is not achieved because they are busily reinforcing their own dependency.

In the course of developing good survivor skills, some LD individuals have had to go against their own moral codes. At times they have had to cheat and lie to survive. Guilt feelings and conflicting emotions which result need to be expressed to relieve some of the anxiety engendered by such actions. It is important to also arrange for the opportunity for LD students to share experiences, to give them the understanding that they are not unique. They are often amazed to hear that other people have difficulties and disabilities similar to their own. The idea that they might share their problems with others, thereby gaining insight and information for themselves as well as helping others, is mind boggling. Ego-centricity is a common characteristic among the learning disabled. In fact, when they come "out of the closet," they see this only in terms of getting help for themselves.

Steady progress should not be expected once the LD student is enrolled in a postsecondary program even with support and accommodations. Because of a history of failure and self-doubt instilled over the years, it is realistic to expect some real ups and downs in regard to his academic achievements. The doubts are usually just under the surface. Nevertheless, success can trigger another phenomenon. A little success can bring about a feeling of euphoria after years of feeling "dumb" and unable to succeed. Unrealistic goals might then be considered, and the management of this situation, helping the person return closer to reality, becomes a delicate issue.

Learning disabled students at the college level tend to be older than the average expected age. (Swan, 1981) Many have transferred to a community or four-year college; some have had support and help; some have surmounted the academic hurdles on their own. Grade records are usually spotty, depending on which subjects fit their strengths and weaknesses, and their interests. For some, working full time after high school or attending college on a one course non-matriculant basis has been important. The learning disabled student may need a few extra years to gain a perspective of the real world, both to mature and to ease the frustrations formerly felt in the academic world.

Being totally honest about college as a realistic and attainable goal for a learning disabled student/adult, it is necessary to stress the need for total commitment and motivation. Even the most perfectly individualized supportive program will not be sufficient without much very hard work by the LD person. Time will always be an enemy. Assignments may take three times as long to complete; reading will probably be laborious; schedules must be adhered to; lectures will drag and semesters will fly by. Time for recreation and social life may have to be curtailed because of the exigency of curricula. However, for the student with the motivation, stamina, and staying power, for this is hard work, a college degree can be the reward. This writer has been most impressed by the courage, intelligence and tremendous drive of learning disabled who have been and/or now college students. Those who succeed do so in spite of the many barriers in their paths. They prove that college is an option for success.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 510 BARNUM AVE., BRIDGEPORT, CONN. 06608

OBJECTIVES FOR A "HOLISTIC" COLLEGE PROGRAM

The learning disabled college student in a holistic program should be able to:

1. Plan an educational program which can lead to graduation.
2. Plan career goals which are realistic and attainable.
3. Make progress in academic skill deficit areas through appropriate remediation procedures.
4. Develop compensatory approaches to skill deficits.
5. Learn and practice life skills such as time management, material organization, stress management, goal setting and decision making.
6. Lessen personal anxiety in regard to new situations.
7. Develop self-confidence to the extent of seeking challenging situations.
8. Lessen the utilization of manipulatory approaches in social situations.
9. Gain academic independence and diminish the need for academic supportive services.

Natalie Bieber
Director, LD Pilot Program

A-2: BATTERY OF TESTS USED FOR ASSESSMENT

Clarke Self-Assessment Reading Survey

Comprehensive Occupational Preference Inventory (COPS)

Gallistel-Ellis Test of Coding Skills

Informal Reading Inventory

Learning Efficiency Test

Learning Style Inventory (Barsch)

Malcomesius Specific Language Disability Test

Minimum Essentials Test

Rey-Osterreith Complex Design Test

Slosson Intelligence Test

Slosson Oral Reading Test

Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test

Test of Written Language (TOWL)

Whimbey Analytic Skills Inventory

Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)

Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery

College Students With Learning Disabilities

OPTIONS FOR SUCCESS

Housatonic Community College

THE LEARNING DISABLED PROGRAM

AT HCC

Learning disabled students have unique talents and special needs.

The LD Program at Housatonic Community College is designed to help LD students use these talents to their fullest potential by providing professional services specifically designed to meet their special needs.

A professional staff works with LD students individually to adapt course content to fit personal learning styles. The students attend regular classes while being tutored. The staff encourages students to fully participate in college activities, including student government, social and cultural events, and recreational activities. In addition, the Housatonic faculty and staff are supportive of each student's progress and desire for success.

OBJECTIVES

1. To attract, identify, and retain students with specific learning disabilities for whom college is a realistic goal.

2. To provide support services and a learning environment essential to the LD students' progress towards completing course requirements.

3. To develop a model program that other post-secondary institutions can reproduce or adapt.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

Any officially enrolled student determined to have a specific learning disability as defined by PL 94-142 is eligible to participate in the program.

An LD specialist interviews and tests students to confirm the presence and nature of the learning disability.

Students whose academic problems are not the result of LD are referred to other college programs for assistance. LD services are offered to the public for a fee on a limited basis.

REFERRAL PROCESS

High school personnel, public agencies such as the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, private organizations such as the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, and other departments at the college refer students to the LD Program.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

STAFF:

* A full-time LD specialist directs the program.
* Reading and math tutors who have master's degrees work with students.
* Peer and faculty tutors instruct in course content.
* A secretary takes dictation and types student papers as needed.

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

* Accredited
* 2 yr. degrees
* Full-time/Part-time
* Transfer Programs

Housatonic Community College, part of the Connecticut College System, is located at 510 Barnum Avenue, Bridgeport, just minutes from the Connecticut Turnpike (I-95). Accredited by the New England Association of schools and colleges, it offers two-year Associate degrees programs and shorter certificate programs.

Students can select majors in accounting, business administration, criminal justice, liberal arts, music, general studies and others. Courses and programs are designed to meet the needs of all Housatonic students. Students can enroll on a full-time or part-time basis; day and evening classes are conveniently scheduled.

Housatonic's faculty are highly trained professionals whose first responsibility is teaching. Many have had successful careers in the private sector providing them with practical experience to combine with their academic training.

Credits earned at Housatonic are transferable to colleges and universities, both public and private, in Connecticut and throughout the nation. Housatonic graduates have gone on to complete bachelors and advanced degrees at some of the country's most prestigious educational institutions.

Housatonic offers a variety of college activities that include social, cultural and sporting events. Housatonic's art collection is the largest of any community college in the nation, featuring a vast collection of modern and ethnic art.

With the cost of the four-year college degree constantly rising, more and more students and their families are discovering that a two-year transfer degree program at Housatonic makes good sense.

SUGGESTIONS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

1. If you know that you have a learning disability and can substantiate your claim, talk to your instructor before the semester begins.
2. If you think that you may have a specific learning disability, but aren't sure contact the Center for Educational Services (Room #425).
3. Set realistic goals and priorities for course work.
4. Use a tape recorder during lectures.
5. Listen to the tape as soon after class as possible to refresh your memory, then reorganize your notes.
6. Sit toward the front of the classroom to maximize your eye contact and to reduce distractions.
7. Estimate how long a given class assignment will take, generally planning on three hours outside of class for every hour in class. Build in study breaks, as fatigue is a big time waster.
8. If you are having trouble, seek campus support help early in the semester.
9. Gain assertiveness and sense of responsibilities.
10. Get involved in clubs and activities.
11. Make new friends.

SERVICES

* Identification of learning disabilities
* Evaluation of strengths and weaknesses
* Determination of learning style
* Academic advising
* Development of compensatory skills
* Use of computer and A-V materials
* Faculty-staff cooperation to maintain academic standards.
* Testing
* Advocacy
* Remediation
* Educational counseling
* Computer literacy
* Word processing instruction
* Alternate administration of exams
* Integration in regular classes

HOUSATONIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE
510 Barnum Avenue
Bridgeport, CT 06608

Natalie Bieber, Director

LD Pilot Program

Telephone # (203) 579-6402

Center for Educational Service (Room #425)

APPENDIX B

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

B-1: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

B-2: STAFFING PATTERN

B-3: ADMISSIONS GUIDELINES AND CORRESPONDENCE

B-4: REFERRAL FORM

B-5: ASSESSMENT BATTERY

B-6: PROGRAM BROCHURE

B-7: DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION PROCEDURES	Fall 1984	Spring 1985	Fall 1985	Spring 1986
1. To develop referral procedures and format.	Review written procedures and forms.	Begin	In Place / Modify If Necessary		
2. To develop procedures and information relative to the intake interview process.	Review written procedures.	Begin	In Place / Modify If Necessary		
3. To develop and implement a model diagnostic battery for LD college students.	Review a list of recommended evaluation instruments. Review completed evaluations.	Begin	In Place / Modify If Necessary		
4. To develop a model psycho-educational report format.	Review of format as well as completed psychoeducational evaluation.	Begin	In Place / Modify If Necessary		
5. To develop an Individualized University Educational Plan format.	Review format as well as individual plans.	Begin	In Place / Modify If Necessary		
6. To develop a multi-disciplinary team approach to determine eligibility and plan a program for LD college students.	Review forms, statements of criteria for eligibility, plans developed for individual students	Begin	In Place / Modify If Necessary		
7. To develop a network of support services (writing, math, counseling, speech, language, and vocational) available to our students. students.	Keep a record of contacts with support services, review this record and the usefulness of these services.	Begin	In Place	Continue	

-41-

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION PROCEDURES	Fall 1984	Spring 1985	Fall 1985	Spring 1986
8. To acquire adequate physical and format.	Check space acquisition. forms.	Begin	In Place		
9. To provide inservice training for faculty at UConn who instruct LD students.	Review documentation and effectiveness of this training. Conduct a study on Attitudes of UConn faculty toward this population.			Begin	
10. To develop a brochure and other written information which can be used to inform students, parents, faculty and administrators about this program.	Review written information.	Begin	In Place	Revise if Necessary	
11. To identify software and procedures for effectively using micro and mainframe computers to service our students.	Record time spent by students using computer facilities. Review purchases of software and/or hardware.	Begin	In Place	Continue Service	
12. To provide a graduate training program which will provide knowledgeable and and experienced personnel to implement LD college programs throughout the State.	Review progress in the development of this training program.			Begin	In Place

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION PROCEDURES	Fall 1984	Spring 1985	Fall 1985	Spring 1986
13. To develop positive and systematic procedures for collaborating with UConn Faculty.	Record faculty contacts. Review record.	Begin	In Place	Continue	
14. To provide statewide information on effective programming for LD college students such that state residents, students, and high school counselors are knowledgeable about this service.	Review dissemination efforts.			Begin	In Place
15. To provide training to staff of other state institutions of higher education as to procedures for servicing LD college students.	Review records of contacts and training implemented at other institutions.		Begin	In Place	Continue
16. To identify and pursue areas of research which will supplement this project.	Review research pursued by the staff of this project.		Begin	In Place	Continue

GOAL: To effectively provide appropriate services to individual students with learning disabilities.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To provide each student with an individually tailored, psychoeducational evaluation.

2. To provide each student with a case manager who will help develop, monitor, and revise program services.

3. To provide each student with specific recommendations regarding academic courses, programs, and credit load.

4. To provide each student, as needed, with direct instructional support, learning strategies, and study skills training and/or content area tutoring.

5. To provide students, when needed, with services to overcome social/emotional/interpersonal limitations which may be associated with a specific learning disability.

GOAL: For students participating in the program to "move away" from services, becoming independent learners.

OBJECTIVES:

1. For student to understand the strengths and weaknesses they bring to the learning process.

2. For students to become independent learners within the university setting. Each student receiving services from UPLD will have an Individualized Educational Plan which includes the following four components:

   a. LD Planning Team - Meeting Minutes;

   b. Program Recommendations;

   c. University Educational Plan (including specific goals and objectives); and

   d. Program Agreement.

B-2: STAFFING PATTERN

Breakdown of Direct Instructional and Evaluation Staff for 1984/85 and 1985/86 Academic Years.

TIME PERIOD	NO. OF STAFF	CHARACTERISTICS		$\bar{X}$ NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK
Fall 1984	1	Program Coordinator		15
	1	Director of School Psychology		4
	2	Doctoral students in Special Education (full-time Graduate Assistants)	20(2)=	40
	1	Masters Students in Special Education (half-time Graduate Assistant)		10
	1	School Psychology practicum student		15
			$\bar{X}$ TOTAL =	84
Spring 1985	1	Program Coordinator		2^
	1	Director of School Psychology		4
	2	Doctoral students in Special Education (full-time Graduate Assistants)	20(2)=	40
	1	Masters Students in Special Education (half-time Graduate Assistant)		20
	1	School Psychology practicum student		15
	1	Counseling Intern on Sabbital Leave		10
			$\bar{X}$ TOTAL =	109

Breakdown of Direct Instructional and Evaluation Staff for 1984/85 and 1985/86 Academic Years.

TIME PERIOD	NO. OF STAFF	CHARACTERISTICS	$\bar{X}$ NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK
Fall 1985	1	Program Coordinator	10
	1	Director of School Psychology	3
	2	Doctoral students in Special Education (full-time Graduate Assistants) 20(2)=	40
	1	Doctoral student in School Psychology (full-time Graduate Assistant)	20
	1	Masters Students in Special Education (half-time Graduate Assistant)	9
	1	Masters student in Special Education/Rehablitative Counseling	9
	1	School Psychology practicum student	4
		$\bar{X}$ TOTAL =	96
Spring 1986	1	Program Coordinator	15
	1	Director of School Psychology	2
	1	Program Director	2
	2	Doctoral students in Special Education (full-time Graduate Assistants) 20(2)=	40
	1	Masters Students in Special Education (half-time Graduate Assistant)	20
	1	Doctoral student in School Psychology (full-time Graduate Assistant)	20
	1	Masters student in Special Education (full-time Graduate Assistant)	20
	1	Masters student in Special Education/ Rehabilitative Counseling	20
		$\bar{X}$ TOTAL =	109

B-3: ADMISSIONS GUIDELINES AND CORRESPONDENCE

DRAFT COPY

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING APPLICATIONS OF LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS FOR UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS

February, 1985

I. INTENT

a. To maintain the quality and standards established for admissions to the University.

b. To provide a means for learning disabled students to present information regarding academic ability and potential to succeed at UConn which does not reflect their disabilities.

c. To guarantee identified learning disabled students the support of the UConn Program for the Learning Disabled College Student (UPLD) following formal admission to the University.

II. ADMISSIONS PROCEDURE

a. The Admissions Office reviews all applications for self-identified learning disabled (LD) students.

b. The Admissions Officee sends a letter to self-identified LD students requesting additional information which reflects potential to succeed at UConn. (See Appendix A for a copy of this letter.) Submitted information suggested to include:

1. Wechsler Intelligence Scale (WAIS-R or WISC-R) report including subscale scores (results must be less than three years old and be administered by a certified school psychologist or licensed psychologist);

2. Standardized achievement test scores (suggested tests are included in the letter to prospective LD students);

3. Writing sample;

4. Current or most recent Individualized Education Program, Annual Review Data, and/or other placement team data (these data will be available if the student has been previously identified as a LD student);

5. The applicant may submit any additional data, including diagnostic, medical, or educational reports which are available; and

6. Additionally, letters from teachers or counselors may be submitted.

c. UPLD reviews all submitted information and provides input to the Admissions Office regarding the applicant's ability to succeed at UConn.

d. The University Admissions Office reviews all information and input and makes an admissions decision. Letter of admittance or rejection is sent. (See Appendix B for sample letters).

E. Admitted LD student strongly urged by the Admissions Office to contact UPLD through a self-referral. (A referral form is found in Appendix C).

Dear

Thank you for applying to the University of Connecticut. In reviewing your application, we find that you have identified yourself as a student who may benefit from the services provided by UConn's Program for the Learning Disabled College Student.

In order to ensure that the information in your application accurately reflects your academic ability and potential to succeed at UConn, we suggest that you submit the following information to the Admissions Office:

1. Results of a complete psychoeducational evaluation, which should at a minimum include:

   a. The Wechsler Intelligence Scale (WAIS-R or WISC-R) <u>including subscale scores</u>. Results should be less than three years old and the test must be administered by a certified school psychologist or a licensed psychologist;

   b. Standardized achievement testing;

      <u>RECOMMENDED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS</u>:

      <u>Stanford Achievement Test</u> or the upper level of this test:
      <u>TASK</u>
      <u>California Achievement Test</u>
      <u>Metropolitan Achievement Test</u>
      <u>Iowa Test of Basic Skills</u>
      <u>SRA Achievement Series</u>

   c. A sample of your written work;

   d. A copy of your current or most recent Individualized Education Program (IEP), Annual Review data, and/or other placement team data (these data should be available if you have previously received special education services);

   e. Any additional data, including diagnostic, medical, or educational reports which are available; and

   f. Additionally, you may submit letters from teachers or counselors.

Upon receipt of this voluntarily submitted information, your application for admission to the Unviersity of Connecticut will be processed and a decision of your admission request will be made.

Sincerely,

The Admissions Office

B-4: REFERRAL FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

School of Education
Special Education Center
Box U-64, Room 227
249 Glenbrook Road
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
(203) 486-4031

UCONN PROGRAM FOR THE LEARNING DISABLED COLLEGE STUDENT (UPLD)

REFERRAL INFORMATION

NAME: _____ **DATE:** _____

ADDRESS: _____ **DATE OF BIRTH:** _____

_____ **REFERRAL SOURCE:** _____

PHONE NUMBER: _____ **MAJOR ADVISOR:** _____

SEMESTER: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 **MAJOR:** _____

_____ Entering Freshman _____ Graduate Student _____ Transfer Student

This section is to be completed by the student in his/her own handwriting:

1. Specific reasons for referral:

2. Please describe the problem: (examples; difficulty with any of the following: reading recognition, comprehension, spelling, written expression, math calculation, applied problems, oral expression, organization, study skills, social difficulties).

3. What services have you previously received?

4. What assistance do you think you will need at UConn?

Please return this form to: Dr. Joan McGuire, Ph.D.
Director, UPLD
at the above address

An Equal Opportunity Employer

B-5: ASSESSMENT BATTERY

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

STANDARD DIAGNOSTIC BATTERY

- Bloomer Learning Test (BLT)
- Stanford Test of Academic Skills (TASK)
- Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised (WAIS-R)

INDIVIDUAL DIAGNOSTIC BATTERY

- Informal Study Skills Inventory
- Lincoln Intermediate Spelling Test
- Orleans-Hanna Algebra Prognosis
- Raven's Test of Progressive Matrices
- Stanford Diagnostic Math Test
- Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
- Test of Written Language (TOWL)
- Test of Written Spelling

The University of Connecticut

Program for the Learning Disabled College Student

School of Education
Special Education Center
The University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

PROGRAM RATIONALE

Increasing numbers of learning disabled adults are seeking admission to colleges and universities. Their quest for post-secondary education has been assured by regulations of Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973. This act specifically states that "no qualified handicapped person shall, on the basis of handicap, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity which receives or benefits from Federal assistance" (Federal Register, Vol. 42, May 4, 1977, pp. 2678).

While most of us are acutely aware of our responsibilities toward the most "obviously" handicapped individuals, i.e., the blind or those confined to wheelchairs, we are often not sensitive to those students with more subtle "hidden" handicaps. The learning disabled are among those with less obvious handicaps, and in increasing numbers they are among our student population.

The University of Connecticut Program for the Learning Disabled College Student represents a commitment toward providing services to both learning disabled students and the faculty who must teach them. This program is designed to complement and supplement existing campus services offering support to disabled students. This program is a component of the Special Education Center.

PROGRAM SERVICES

Students in the program are actively enrolled or pursuing enrollment in the University. Enrollment in this program serves as a supplement to their regular University curriculum. Educational and diagnostic services are provided by trained learning disability specialists experienced in working with learning disabled students. Services are provided at no cost to eligible students.

Students can be referred to the program in several ways, such as by UConn faculty or staff, a high school or community college counselor, or by self-referral. Once referred, the program staff will interview the student to gain insight into the nature of the possible disability. The student may then be formally evaluated and recommendations made as to how the student can best meet his/her academic and vocational potential. A Learning Disability Planning Team will meet to determine eligibility, plan an appropriate educational program, and specify student support services required.

The LD College Program provides comprehensive and individualized services to each student as needed. In addition to the academic counseling and tutorial support services provided by the learning disability specialists, the Disabled Student Services Center and other campus programs, including Counseling Services, the Speech and Hearing Clinic, Center for Academic Programs, Writing Resource Center, and Mental Health Services, provide student assistance. The staff of the LD College Program also works closely with the student's advisor and professors to plan and implement a successful academic experience. Services provided include scheduling, consultation with faculty regarding modifications in content or presentation of material and alternative testing procedures. The LD College Program is committed to having one LD specialist work with each student to develop, organize, monitor and evaluate *all* services provided.

PROGRAM ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

For admission to the UCONN PROGRAM FOR THE LEARNING DISABLED COLLEGE STUDENT the applicant must:

1. Complete a referral form.
2. Schedule a personal interview.
3. Have a complete psychoeducational evaluation which may include the following components:
   - •Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale — Revised (WAIS-R)
   - •Standardized Achievement Testing
   - •Individual Diagnostic Testing

NOTE: If you possess any relevant educational, medical, or diagnostic records which would help us in the evaluative process, please submit this information.

ADMISSION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

If not a UCONN student already, admission to the University must also be sought. You should contact the Admissions Office, The University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268. Your application for admission should include a cover letter indicating that you are learning disabled, if you wish to be considered for the modified LD admission process.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Please feel free to call or write for referral and admission information to:

Dr. Joan McGuire, Assistant Professor
UConn Program for the Learning Disabled
The University of Connecticut
Special Education Center
U-64, 249 Glenbrook Road
Storrs, CT 06268
PHONE: (203) 486-4033, 4031, or 4032

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NUMERICAL LISTING

1 — E. O. Smith High School
2 — Dramatic Arts & Music
3 — Van der Mohden Recital Hall
4 — Music Building (Studios, Library)
5 — Music Dome
6 — Art Building
7 — Communication Sciences Building
8 — Human Development & Family Relations Building
9 — Information Booth
10 — South Campus Residences
11 — Alumni Quadrangle
12 — Skating Rink
13 — Warming Hut
14 — McMahon Hall
15 — Horticulture Storage
16 — West Campus Residences
17 — Graduate Residences
18 — Wheaton Graduate Center
19 — University of Connecticut Library
20 — Co-op Bookstore
21 — Institute of Urban Research
22 — Women's Center
23 — Counseling and Student Development Center
24 — Arjona Building (Humanities)
25 — Psychology Building
26 — Hawley Armory
27 — Monteith Building (Social Sciences)
27a — Andre Schiesser Lecture Hall (AS 55)
28 — Budds Building (Administration)
29 — International House
30 — Manchester Hall
31 — Home Economics Building
32 — Beach Building
33 — Gurley Hall (Executive Offices)
34 — Chemistry Building
35 — Storrs Hall
36 — Wilbur Cross Building
37 — Koons Hall
38 — Hall Dorm (Offices)
39 — William Benton Museum of Art
40 — Wood Hall
41 — Gentry Building (Education)
42 — Business Administration Building
43 — Pharmacy (W. G. Hewitt Bldg.)
43a — Pharmacy Research
44 — Commons
45 — Student Union
46 — Castleman Building (Engineering I)
47 — Puerto Rican Center
48 — Field House
49 — Athletics/Sport & Leisure Studies
50 — Athletic Facilities Building
51 — Memorial Stadium
52 — Putnam Refectory
53 — Hale Hall
54 — Ellsworth Hall
55 — Technical Services Center
56 — ROTC Building
57 — Faculty-Alumni Center
58 — Jorgensen Auditorium
59 — Jorgensen Theatre
60 — Mathematical Sciences Building
61 — Physics Building
62 — Materials Science Building
63 — Engineering III
64 — Engineering II
65 — Life Sciences (Torrey Bldg.) & Annex
66 — Pharmacy Maintenance Building
67 — Fire Department
68 — Atwater Laboratory (Animal Genetics)
69 — Central Warehouse
70 — Health Services (Infirmary)
71 — Pathology Building
72 — Nursing Building
73 — Planetarium
74 — CDC Newspaper/Credit Union
75 — Traffic Services
76 — Motor Pool
77 — Northwest Quadrangle
78 — North Campus Residences
79 — Hillel House (Jewish)
80 — Aquinas Center
81 — St. Thomas Aquinas Chapel (Roman Catholic)
82 — St. Mark's Chapel (Episcopal)
83 — Lakeside Apartments
84 — Admissions Building
85 — Community House
86 — Storrs Congregational Church
87 — Towers Student Activities Center
88 — Towers Residences
89 — Information Booth
90 — Public Safety Division
91 — Dairy Barn
92 — Floriculture (Greenhouse)
93 — Farm Machinery Building (Ag. Engr.)
94 — White Building (Animal Industries)
95 — Grounds Maintenance
96 — Jones Building (Nutritional Sciences)
97 — W. B. Young Building (College of Ag.)
98 — Ratcliffe Hicks Building
99 — Hicks Hall
100 — Grange Hall
101 — Holcomb, Whitney & Sprague Halls
102 — Commissary Warehouse
103 — Honors House
104 — President's Residence
105 — Shippee Hall
106 — Bishop Continuing Education Center
107 — Buckley Hall
108 — Publications Building
109 — Wore Theatre
110 — Shopping Center
111 — Art Printshop/Art Design Center
112 — Biobehavioral Sciences Buildings
113 — Diagnostic Testing Labs/Microchemistry

ALPHABETICAL LISTING

42 — Accounting (Business Adm. Bldg.)
84 — Admissions Building
44 — Afro-American Cultural Ctr. (Commons)
97 — Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology (W. B. Young Bldg.)
97 — Agricultural Engineering (Young Bldg.)
97 — Agricultural Publications (Young Bldg.)
97 — Agriculture & Natural Resources (Young Bldg.)
37 — Allied Health Professions (Koons Hall)
11 — Alumni Quadrangle
29a — Andre Schiesser Lecture Hall (AS 55)
68 — Animal Genetics (Atwater Lab)
94 — Animal Industries (George White Bldg.)
71 — Animal Pathology (Pathology Bldg.)
30/32 — Anthropology (Manchester Hall & Beach Bldg.)
80 — Aquinas Center
24 — Arjona Building (Humanities)
6 — Art Building
111 — Art Printshop/Art Design Center
50 — Athletic Facilities Building
49 — Athletics
68 — Atwater Laboratory
32 — Beach Building
39 — William Benton Museum of Art
113 — Biobehavioral Sciences Buildings
65 — Biological Sciences (Life Sci. Bldg.)
106 — Bishop Continuing Education Center
48 — Brundage Pool
107 — Buckley Hall
28 — Budds Building (Administration)
42 — Business Administration
43 — Business, Environ. & Policy (Bus. Adm. Bldg.)
46 — Castleman Building (Engineering I)
61 — Center for Instructional Media & Technology (Gentry Bldg.)
97 — Central Duplicating (W. B. Young Bldg.)
69 — Central Warehouse
34 — Chemistry Building
64 — Chemical Engineering (Engr. II)
9 — Child Development Laboratories (Human Dev. & Family Relations Bldg.)
46 — Civil Engineering (Castleman Bldg.)
102 — Commissary Warehouse
44 — Commons
7 — Communication Sciences
88 — Community House
60 — Computer Systems (Math. Sci. Bldg.)
74 — Connecticut Daily Campus Newspaper
20 — Co-op Bookstore
23 — Counseling and Student Dev. Center
74 — Credit Union
36 — Wilbur Cross Building
61 — Curriculum & Instruction (Gentry Bldg.)
91 — Dairy Barn
22 — Women's Center
23 — Counseling and Student Development Center
24 — Arjona Building (Humanities)
25 — Psychology Building
26 — Hawley Armory
27 — Monteith Building (Social Sciences)
27a — Andre Schiesser Lecture Hall (AS 55)
28 — Budds Building (Administration)
29 — International House
30 — Manchester Hall
31 — Home Economics Building
32 — Beach Building
33 — Gurley Hall (Executive Offices)
34 — Chemistry Building
35 — Storrs Hall
36 — Wilbur Cross Building
37 — Koons Hall
38 — Hall Dorm (Offices)
39 — William Benton Museum of Art
40 — Wood Hall
41 — Gentry Building (Education)
42 — Business Administration Building
43 — Pharmacy (W. G. Hewitt Bldg.)
31 — Design & Resource Management (Home Economics Bldg.)
38 — Development Office (W. Cross Bldg.)
113 — Diagnostic Testing Labs/Microchemistry
2 — Dramatic Arts
27 — Economics (Monteith Bldg.)
41 — Education (Gentry Bldg.)
41 — Educational Adm. (Gentry Bldg.)
41 — Educational Psych. (Gentry Bldg.)
41 — Educational Studies & Instr. Media (Gentry Bldg.)
63 — Electrical Engr. & Computer Sci. (Engr. III)
54 — Ellsworth Hall
46 — Engineering I (Castleman Bldg.)
64 — Engineering II
63 — Engineering III
34 — English (Arjona Bldg.)
57 — Faculty-Alumni Center
93 — Farm Machinery Building (Ag. Engr.)
48 — Field House
42 — Finance
8 — Fine Arts (Art Bldg.)
87 — Fire Department
92 — Floriculture (Greenhouse)
41 — Gentry Building (School of Education)
33 — Geography (Beach Bldg.)
32 — Geology & Geophysics (Beach Bldg.)
34 — Germanic & Slavic Lang. (Arjona Bldg.)
18 — Graduate Center (Nathan L. Whetten)
117 — Graduate Residences
100 — Grange Hall
92 — Greenhouse Design Lab (GH DL)
92 — Greenhouse Potting Lab (GH PL)
95 — Grounds Maintenance
33 — Gurley Hall (Executive Offices)
53 — Hale Hall
38 — Hall Dorm (Offices)
26 — Hawley Armory
70 — Health Services (Infirmary)
43 — H.G. Hewitt Building (Pharmacy)
99 — Hicks Hall
41 — Higher, Tech. & Adult Ed. (Gentry Bldg.)
79 — Hillel House (Jewish)
40 — History (Wood Hall)
101 — Holcomb Hall
31 — Home Economics & Family Studies (Home Ec. Bldg.)
31 — Home Economics Building
103 — Honors House
15 — Horticulture Storage
35 — Housing — Resid. Halls (Hall Dorm)
8 — Human Dev. & Family Relations
34 — Humanities (Arjona Bldg.)
42 — Industrial Administration
70 — Infirmary (Health Services)
89/90 — Information Booths
42 — Information Management (Bus. Adm. Bldg.)
21 — Institute of Urban Research
79 — International Center
96 — Jones Building
58 — Jorgensen Auditorium
59 — Jorgensen Theatre
24 — Journalism (Arjona Bldg.)
37 — Koons Hall
83 — Lakeside Apartments (Guest Facilities)
40 — Liberal Arts & Sciences (Wood Hall)
19 — Library
65 — Life Sciences (Torrey Bldg.) & Annex
27 — Linguistics (Monteith Bldg.)
108 — Mailing Services (Pubs. Bldg.)
42 — Management & Organization (Bus. Adm. Bldg.)
30 — Manchester Hall
42 — Marketing (School of Business Adm.)
62 — Materials Science Building
60 — Mathematical Sciences Building
14 — McMahon Hall
64 — Mechanical Engineering (Engr. II)
51 — Memorial Stadium
62 — Metallurgy (Materials Sci. Bldg.)
113 — Microchemistry/Diagnostic Testing Labs
27 — Monteith Building (Social Sciences)
76 — Motor Pool
109 — Wore Theatre
2 — Music
4 — Music Building (Studios & Library)
5 — Music Dome
39 — Museum (W. Benton Museum of Art)
78 — North Campus Residences
72 — Nursing Building
96 — Nutritional Sciences (Jones Bldg.)
71 — Pathobiology (Pathology Bldg.)
84 — Personnel Services (Admissions Bldg.)
43 — Pharmacy (W. G. Hewitt Bldg.)
43a — Pharmacy Research
30 — Philosophy (Manchester Hall)
66 — Physical Plant Building (Maintenance)
61 — Physics Building
73 — Planetarium
66 — Plant Maintenance Building
97 — Plant Science (W. B. Young Bldg.)
27 — Political Science (Monteith Bldg.)
104 — President's Residence
25 — Psychology Building
108 — Publications Building
97 — Public Information (W. B. Young Bldg.)
90 — Public Safety
47 — Puerto Rican Center
52 — Putnam Refectory
98 — Ratcliffe Hicks Building
42 — Real Estate Center (Bus. Adm. Bldg.)
97 — Renewable Natural Resources (Young Bldg.)
24 — Romance & Classical Languages (Arjona Bldg.)
50 — ROTC Building
97 — Rural Sociology (Young Bldg.)
11 — Ryan Refectory (Alumni Quadrangle)
82 — St. Mark's Chapel (Episcopal)
81 — St. Thomas Aquinas Chapel (Roman Catholic)
105 — Shippee Hall
110 — Shopping Center
12 — Skating Rink
1 — E. O. Smith High School
101 — Sprague Hall
27 — Social Sciences (Monteith Bldg.)
30 — Sociology (Manchester Hall)
10 — South Campus Residences
49 — Sport & Leisure Studies
60 — Statistics (Math. Sci. Bldg.)
86 — Storrs Congregational Church
35 — Storrs Hall
38 — Student Employment (W. Cross Bldg.)
45 — Student Union
55 — Technical Services Center
56 — Telecommunications — Cntr. for Instructional Media & Technology (Jorgenson Auditorium Bldg.)
65 — G.S. Torrey Building (Life Sci. & Annex)
88 — Towers Residences
87 — Towers Student Activities Center
75 — Traffic Services
46 — Transportation Institute (Castleman Bldg.)
61 — University Center for Instructional Media & Technology (Gentry Bldg.)
60 — University Computer Systems (Math. Sci. Bldg.)
19 — University of Connecticut Library
3 — Van der Mohden Recital Hall
97 — W. B. Young Building (College of Ag.)
13 — Warming Hut
16 — West Campus Residences
94 — White Building (Animal Industries)
101 — Whitney Hall
22 — Women's Center
40 — Wood Hall

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

97 — College of Agriculture & Natural Resources
37 — School of Allied Health Professions
42 — School of Business Administration
61 — School of Education
46 — School of Engineering
6 — School of Fine Arts
18 — Graduate School
31 — School of Home Economics & Family Studies
40 — College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
72 — School of Nursing
43 — School of Pharmacy
98 — Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

42 — Accounting
97 — Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology
83 — Agricultural Engineering
68 — Animal Genetics (Atwater Laboratory)
94 — Animal Industries
30/32 — Anthropology
6 — Art
112 — Biobehavioral Sciences
32/65 — Biological Sciences Group
42 — Business, Environment & Policy
64 — Chemical Engineering
34 — Chemistry
46 — Civil Engineering
7 — Communication Sciences
61 — Curriculum & Instruction
31 — Design & Resource Management Program
2 — Dramatic Arts
27 — Economics
41 — Educational Administration
41 — Educational Psychology
41 — Educational Studies & Instructional Media
63 — Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
34 — English
42 — Finance
32 — Geography
32 — Geology & Geophysics
34 — Germanic & Slavic Languages
41 — Higher, Technical & Adult Education
40 — History
9 — Human Development & Family Relations Program
42 — Information Management
24 — Journalism
27 — Linguistics
42 — Management and Organization
42 — Marketing
60 — Mathematics
64 — Mechanical Engineering
62 — Metallurgy
2 — Music
96 — Nutritional Sciences
71 — Pathobiology
30 — Philosophy
61 — Physics
97 — Plant Science
27 — Political Science
25 — Psychology
97 — Renewable Natural Resources
24 — Romance & Classical Languages
97 — Rural Sociology
30 — Sociology
49 — Sport & Leisure Studies
60 — Statistics

Training. Year I. 1984/85

1. Faculty member from Mohegan Community College took a sabbatical with our program to develop testing - instructional skills with LD college students.

2. Interns from school pscyhology and counseling psychology completed internships with our program.

3. Graduate training programs for LD college personnel have been developed in the UConn Educational Psychology Department. Currently, four (4) students were enrolled at the M.A. and Ph.D. levels.

4. Connecticut Vocational Rehabilitation counselors: training in the assessment of and planning for LD college students.

5. Provided inservice training to students and staff from Tourtellotte Memorial High School regarding preparing for college and selecting the appropriate program.

Year II: 1985/86

1. Provided inservice training to guidance and administrative staff as well as faculty members at Quinebaug Valley Community College. Evaluation of student strengths and weaknesses as well as methods of service delivery were areas stressed.

2. Provided inservice training to students and staff from East Lyme High School regarding preparing for college and selecting the appropriate program.

3. Inservice training for and consultation with faculty, administration, and admissions personnel at Georgian Court College, focusing on program planning for LD college students.

4. Provided consultation and grant reviews to the New Jersey Department of Higehr Education.

5. A planning meeting was held at the Avery Point Branc; administrative staff was included.

6. Provided inservice training to staff in the Office of Student Affairs (headed by the Dean of Students).

7. A three-year, Federal Leadership Training Grant has been funded to train leadership personnel at the Ph.D. level. To begin in the Fall of 1986.

Papers and Presentations.

Norlander, K.A., Apthorp, H., Shaw, S.F., & Paolitto, T. (1985, April). The University of Connecticut's learning disability pilot project: Program development and evaluation. Paper presented at the New England Educational Research Organization, Rockport, ME.

Norlander, K., Shaw, S., Czajkowski, A., Apthorp, H., & Beck, T. (1985, May). Delivery of services to learning disabled college students: A team approach. Paper presented at the Seventh National Conference on College Learning Assistance Centers, Long Island University: Brooklyn, NY.

Shaw, S.F., & Norlander, K.A. (1985, July). The development and implementation of an LD college program. Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Conference of the Association on handicapped Student Service Programs in Postsecondary Education (AHSSPPE), Atlanta, GA.

Beck, T., & Duke-Moran, C. (1985, July). Computer spelling software for the learning disabled. Presentation at ConnSENSE, Storrs, CT.

Norlander, K., Shaw, S.F., McGuire, J., Ardaiolo, F., Apthorp, H., Beck, T., Czajkowski, A., & Paolitto, A. (1985, October). Program planning for LD college students. Paper presented at The Northeastern Education Research Association, Kerhonkson, NY.

Norlander, K., Shaw, S.F, Bloomer, R., & Paolitto, A. (1985, October). The assessment of individual needs and program planning for LD college students: A team approach. Paper presented at the Seventh International Conference on Learning Disabilities, New Orleans, LA.

Shaw, S.F, & Norlander, K.A. (1985, November). The special educator's role in teacher training for personnel working with LD college students. Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Teacher Education Division of The Council for Exceptional Children (TED) Conference, Washington, DC.

Beck, T. (1985, November). Learning strategies approach to study skills. Presentation at the Massachusetts Federation of the Council for Exceptional Children, Framingham, MA.

Beck, T. (1985, November). Instructional approaches to spelling for secondary and possecondary students with learning disabilities. Presentation at the Massachusetts Federation of the Council for Exceptional Children, Framingham, MA.

Norlander, K., Paolitto, A., & Czajkowski, A. (1985, December). Evaluation of learning disabled college students: A profile analysis approach. Paper presented at the American Reading Forum, Sarasota, FL.

Shaw, S.F., & Norlander, K.A. (1985). Delivering services to the postsecondary student with learning disabilities: The Unviersity of Connnecticut Program. In J. Gartner (Ed.), Tomorrow is another day (pp. 96-102). Columbus, OH: AHSSPPE.

Czajkowski, A., Norlander, K., Apthorp, H., Beck, T., & Paolitto, A. (1986, March). Evaluative procedures for postsecondary learning disabled students and the effects on program planning. Paper presented at ACLD International Conference, New York, NY.

Ardaiolo, F., Shaw, S., Pollack, R., & Norlander, K. (1986, March). Responding to the learning disabled: A collaborative faculty and student affairs effort. Presentation at the Ninth National Conference on Student Development, Storrs, CT.

Norlander, K.A., Czajkowski, A., & Paolitto, A. (1986, April). Evaluation of learning disabled college students: A team approach. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists annual convention, Hollywood, FL.

Beck, T., & Edyburn, D. (1986, April). The use of computers to teach spelling: The interface of technology and spelling methodology. Paper presented at CEC's 64th Annual Convention, new Orleans, LA.

Shaw, S., & Norlander, K. (in press). The special educator's role in training personnel to provide assistance to college students with learning disabilities. Teacher Education and Special Education, (to be published in Vol. 9, No. 2).

Shaw, S.F., & Norlander, K.A. (in press). Special educator's role in teacher training for personnel working with learning disabled college students. ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Beck, T. (1986, July). Computers and the learning disabled adult. Presentation to be done at ConnSENSE, Storrs, CT.

Invited Workshop Presentations.

Department of Vocational Rehablitation (Norwich Office).
TOPIC: Identification of and Planning for LD College Students
February 12, 1985.

Conference funded by Regional Community Colleges, South Central Community College.
TOPIC: College: Realistic Goals for the Learning Disabled
April 19, 1985

Center for Academic Programs - UConn Program.
TOPIC: Identification of LD Students and Descriptio of UConn's LD Program
February 15, 1985

Conference on Campus Access for Students with Learning Disbilities, Southern Connecticut University.
TOPIC: Description of UConn's Model Program
June 1, 1985

SERC Workshops
TOPIC: Preparing LD Students for College
November, 1985 (4 sessions)

Elmcrest Psychiatric Hospital
TOPIC: Characteristics of Programs for LD Adolescents
October 7, 1985

Connecticut ACLD Executive Board
TOPIC: LD College Programming
December 5, 1985

New England Branch of the Orton Dyslexia Society
TOPIC: Implementing support services for postsecondary students with learning disabilities: Admission through service delivery.
May 10, 1986